DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 035 IR 050 643

AUTHOR Peterson, Lorna
TITLE Administrative Review at the Iowa State University Library Technical Services Division: A Case Study.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Library.
PUB DATE [Dec 83]
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Administrator Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; *Job Performance; Leadership Qualities; *Library Administration; Library Personnel; Library Technical Processes; Questionnaires; Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa State University

ABSTRACT

A personnel appraisal tool was developed at the Iowa State University Library for professionals supervised by the Assistant Director for Technical Services and the Head of the Monographs Department, to evaluate both their supervisors' performance and the appraisal review as an educational tool to improve administrator performance. A Technical Services faculty committee chose the Annual Supervision Evaluation Form of the University of Texas at Austin, the General Libraries, with modifications to reflect Iowa State University Library concerns. The questionnaires provided a list of statements with a scale to indicate the degree to which the statement applied to the supervisor, and a narrative section soliciting typed comments. Administrative skills covered included planning and organizing work, use of time, fairness to supervisees, communication skills, cooperation, management abilities, leadership abilities, and thoroughness of implementing plans. Different statements were used for directly and indirectly supervised faculty, and the questionnaire was modified for the Monographs Department. Though the upward evaluation was perceived as beneficial in providing information to improve administrative style, both administrators characterized the questionnaire as impersonal and limited and suggested possible changes or additions. The few written comments received were found helpful. (LMM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lorna Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED241035

Administrative Review at the Iowa State University Library Technical Services Division: A case study

[Lorna Peterson]

Library personnel evaluation traditionally follows a hierarchical pecking order; that is, the supervisor evaluates the supervised. Limited in direction, this type of evaluation rarely provides feedback to the supervisor. It assumes that the supervisor's performance has little bearing on the performance of supervisees.

At the Iowa State University Library, the Assistant Director for Technical Services and the Head of the Monographs Department decided to reverse this trend. Professionals supervised by these two administrators were given the opportunity to evaluate their supervisor's performance.

The Assistant Director for Technical Services requested this evaluation method first. Her primary concern was to glean her staff's opinions on leadership and how she fits into the leadership role expectations. The appraisal review was defined as an educational tool; that is, as a means to pinpoint and encourage that which is being done well and to target and strengthen shortcomings.

Devising the appraisal review was presented to the Technical Services faculty at a regular meeting. With the exception of leadership concerns, the faculty was responsible for determining the emphasis of the review and the method to conduct the review. The Assistant Director provided a six month deadline to complete the task.

An ad hoc committee of five Technical Services librarians representing the departments of monographs, serials, and orders was selected. The committee circulated a memo to solicit ideas from the Technical Services faculty. At the same time, the committee researched personnel appraisal forms. The memo resulted in no response. Thus, the committee decided upon the Annual Supervisor Evaluation Form, University of Texas at Austin, the General Libraries.

To reflect Iowa State University Library concerns in general and Technical Services concerns in particular, the committee modified the University of Texas at Austin form. Modification resulted in deleting six questions and one part. The part deleted is the "Comments about the supervisor evaluation." The committee decided to perform the faculty's evaluation

IR050643

of the review process at a later date.

The committee divided the Technical Services faculty into two groups. The two groups are those directly supervised and those indirectly supervised, defined by the committee as others. For the Assistant Director this was four supervised and fourteen others. For the Head of the Monographs Department this was four supervised and six others.

Final draft of the evaluation for the Assistant Director consists of three components. The first is an introductory statement and directions. The second is a questionnaire of 38 questions for the directly supervised and 29 questions for the indirectly supervised. A choice of five responses is given. Only one response per question is allowed. The choice of responses are the following:

1= Description fits very well

2= Description fits fairly well

3= Description doesn't fit very well

4= Description doesn't fit at all

5= No opinion or not applicable

Component three is part II of the evaluation. This is the narrative portion of the review. To insure confidentiality, typed comments were suggested. These comments were submitted directly to the Assistant Director. The answer sheet was turned in to one committee member as selected by the committee.

Two weeks were allotted for completion of the questionnaire. Three weeks were allotted for the narrative portion.

The questionnaire covers planning and organizing work, use of time, fairness to supervisees, communication skills, cooperation, management abilities, leadership abilities, and thoroughness of implementing plans.

Following the Assistant Director evalutation, the Head of the Monographs Department approached the two monographs representatives of the Ad Hoc Committee for Administrative Review to conduct her evaluation. The procedure was basically the same as the method devised for the Assistant Director. The same number of forms was provided with the same

directions and the same amount of time to complete the evaluation. Differences between the two appraisal forms are the number of questions asked (38/29 for the Assistant Director, 26/21 for the Head of the Monographs Department) and slight modification of the types of questions asked. The issues remain the same; questions concern the monographs department specifically rather than the Technical Services division and University administration generally.

Nineteen of the nineteen Technical Services faculty participated in the questionnaire evaluation for the Assistant Director for Technical Services. Eight of the ten Monographs Department faculty participated in the Head of the Monographs Department evaluation.

Both administrators voiced dissatisfaction with the questionnaire. The questionnaire was characterized as impersonal and limited.

Specifically, the Assistant Director disliked the management emphasis. Rather than viewing herself as an executive, she views herself as an educator. Questions evaluating the position as a mentor rather than an administrator would have been preferred. It was preferred to have questions which evaluated the ability to spark enthusiasm for the library profession and the ability to provide career opportunities and guidance. Further disappointment was with the paucity of narrative appraisals submitted. Of the nineteen faculty members participating in the review, only two submitted narrative comments.

On the positive side, the Assistant Director liked the division of supervisors and others. By knowing where in the hierarchical structure certain concerns were coming from, it was easier to determine the source of the problem.

The upward evaluation was perceived as beneficial by the Assistant Director. The evaluation provided the Assistant Director with more information with which to improve her administrative style. In regards to the lack of written comments, requiring individual oral assessments was suggested.

The Head of the Monographs Department specifically would have preferred a broader scale of responses. And although she felt the questionnaire covered areas of her concern well, she would have liked other areas addressed. In response to her evaluation, the Head of Monographs listed six concerns she would like covered. The six are the following:

a) delegation of responsibility and authority

b) communication skills (listening, speaking, writing)

c) flexibility

d) judgement

e) working relationships within own unit

f) approach to difficult situations/action taken with problems

Similar to the Assistant Director, the Head of the Monographs Department found the written appraisal the most helpful. The written comments tended to be more specific and personal. Again, few members of the Monographs Department submitted narrative comments. Of the eight faculty members participating in the evaluation, three submitted written comments.

Obviously, the narrative portion enhances the objective questionnaire. Short of making the narrative portion mandatory, there can be no guarantee of appraisees taking time and effort to complete the descriptive part. Suggested alternatives by the administrators are oral appraisals and fill-in-the-blank questions to encourage expression of individual concerns.

Administrative review at the Iowa State University Library is seen primarily as an educational device. It is to be used for career development and enhancement. Areas of success are lauded and areas needing improvement are delinated.

This evaluation process does not affect salary decisions, and it is not part of the formal evaluation process. Its conduction is the choice of the administrator.

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

At the request of the Assistant Director for Technical Services you are eligible to rate her performance using the attached questionnaire. Please circle one response per answer. Return the questionnaire to the Ad Hoc Committee on Administrative Review. Please submit the narrative evaluation to the Assistant Director.

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

Supervised

1 = Description fits very well
2 = Description fits fairly well
3 = Description doesn't fit very well
4 = Description doesn't fit at all
5 = No opinion or not applicable

1. Keeps you informed on matters affecting you and your work.

2. Maintains good working relations with other library units.

3. Gives clear work assignments and adequate instructions.

4. Gives proper and generous recognition to others for their contributions.

5. Is receptive to new ideas.

6. Is readily approachable when you need to see her.

7. Makes you feel free to ask questions and express ideas.

8. Represents staff concerns to higher management.

9. Makes you feel you are working with, rather than for, her.

10. Is fair and impartial in dealing with employees.

11. Has a basic understanding of your total faculty responsibilities: primary assignment and secondary areas.

12. Does not arbitrarily or without sufficient explanation change assignments or routines.

13. Provides regular frequent feedback on your job performance.

14. Gives you guidelines well in advance on how you will be evaluated.

15. Makes clear her expectations of you and your work.

16. Knowledgeable about technical services operations.

17. Properly delegates authority.

18. Clearly defines lines of authority.

19. Is skilled in managerial/administrative aspects of her position.

20. Motivates workers to do their best.

21. Is alert to potential problems.

22. Encourages initiative and innovation.

23. Strives to help those under her supervision develop their full potential.

24. Insures that new employees receive thorough training, orientation, and integration into technical services.

25. Plans, paces, and organizes the work of technical services.

26. Approaches problem solving in a systematic fashion.

27. Gathers related information and facts before acting on a problem.

28. Consults with persons involved before making changes.

29. Tactful and considerate in dealing with employees.

30. Understands the library/university well enough to refer matters to the proper offices/persons for effective action.

31. Understands the library/university well enough to respond to questions from internal and external sources.

32. Makes positive contributions to the morale of technical services.

33. Acknowledges her own limitations and mistakes.

34. Enthusiastic about library work.

35. Runs meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

36. Respects employees as individuals.

37. Is accessible when needed.

38. Clearly states goals for the future of technical services.

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

Supervised

Please circle only one response for each question.

Item	Response					Item	Response				
1.	1	2	3	4	5	21.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	1	2	3	4	5	22.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	1	2	3	4	5	23.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	1	2	3	4	5	24.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	1	2	3	4	5	25.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	1	2	3	4	5	26.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	1	2	3	4	5	27.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	1	2	3	4	5	28.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	1	2	3	4	5	29.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	1	2	3	4	5	30.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	1	2	3	4	5	31.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	1	2	3	4	5	32.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	1	2	3	4	5	33.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	1	2	3	4	5	34.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	1	2	3	4	5	35.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	1	2	3	4	5	36.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	1	2	3	4	5	37.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	1	2	3	4	5	38.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	1	2	3	4	5						
20.	1	2	3	4	5						

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

Others

1 = Description fits very well
2 = Description fits fairly well
3 = Description doesn't fit very well
4 = Description doesn't fit at all
5 = No opinion or not applicable

1. Keeps you informed on matters affecting you and your work.
2. Gives proper and generous recognition to others for their contributions.
3. Is receptive to new ideas.
4. Is readily approachable when you need to see her.
5. Makes you feel free to ask questions and express ideas.
6. Makes you feel you are working with, rather than for, her.
7. Is fair and impartial in dealing with employees.
8. Has a basic understanding of your total faculty responsibilities: primary assignment and secondary areas.
9. Makes clear her expectations of you and your work.
10. Knowledgeable about technical services operations.
11. Properly delegates authority.
12. Clearly defines lines of authority.
13. Is skilled in managerial/administrative aspects of her position.
14. Motivates her workers to do their best.
15. Is alert to potential problems.
16. Encourages initiative and innovation.
17. Strives to help those under her supervision develop their full potential.
18. Insures that new employees receive thorough training, orientation, and integration into technical services.
19. Plans, paces, and organizes the work of technical services.
20. Consults with persons involved before making changes.
21. Tactful and considerate in dealing with employees.

22. Understands the library/university well enough to refer matters to the proper offices/persons for effective action.

23. Understands the library/university well enough to respond to questions from internal and external sources.

24. Makes positive contributions to the morale of technical services.

25. Enthusiastic about library work.

26. Runs meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

27. Respects employees as individuals.

28. Is accessible when needed.

29. Clearly states goals for the future of technical services.

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

Others

Please circle only one response for each question.

Item	Response					Item	Response				
1.	1	2	3	4	5	21.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	1	2	3	4	5	22.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	1	2	3	4	5	23.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	1	2	3	4	5	24.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	1	2	3	4	5	25.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	1	2	3	4	5	26.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	1	2	3	4	5	27.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	1	2	3	4	5	28.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	1	2	3	4	5	29.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	1	2	3	4	5						
11.	1	2	3	4	5						
12.	1	2	3	4	5						
13.	1	2	3	4	5						
14.	1	2	3	4	5						
15.	1	2	3	4	5						
16.	1	2	3	4	5						
17.	1	2	3	4	5						
18.	1	2	3	4	5						
19.	1	2	3	4	5						
20.	1	2	3	4	5						

EVALUATION

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR TECHNICAL SERVICES

PART II. You may, if desired, write a further appraisal using this form. Submit Part II separately to the Assistant Director for Technical Services. To help insure confidentiality, you may want to type your comments.

A. Additional comments on expectations of this position.

B. Other comments.

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

The Head of the Monographs Department asked to be evaluated while she is on vacation. She was pleased with the format of the Assistant Director for Technical Services evaluation and requested that we modify and use it for her evaluation.

Please complete Part I by July 22.
Please complete Part II by July 30.

There are boxes for completed forms in the office of the Head of the Monographs Department.

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

Supervised

1 = Description fits very well
2 = Description fits fairly well
3 = Description doesn't fit at all
4 = No opinion or not applicable

1. Keeps you informed on matters affecting you and your work.

2. Maintains good working relations with other library units.

3. Gives clear work assignments, adequate instructions and does not arbitrarily change assignments or routines.

4. Gives proper and generous recognition to you for your contributions.

5. Gives proper and generous recognition of your contributions to her superiors.

6. Is receptive to new ideas and encourages innovation and initiative.

7. Is readily approachable when you need to see her.

8. Makes you feel free to ask questions and express ideas.

9. Represents staff concerns to higher management.

10. Makes you feel you are working with, rather than for, her.

11. Is fair and impartial in dealing with employees.

12. Has a basic understanding of your total faculty responsibilities: primary assignment and secondary areas.

13. Provides regular frequent feedback on your job performance and gives you guidelines well in advance on how you will be evaluated.

14. Knowledgeable about technical service operations.

15. Plans, paces and organizes the work of the Monographs Department.

16. Insures that new employees receive thorough training, orientation, and integration into the Monographs Department.

17. Is skilled in managerial/administrative aspects of her position.

18. Is alert to potential problems.

19. Approaches problem solving in a systematic fashion by gathering related information and facts before acting on a problem.

20. Honors confidentiality.

21. Tactful and considerate in dealing with employees.

22. Acknowledges her own limitations and mistakes.

23. Involved with professional issues.

24. Runs small group meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

25. Runs large group meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

26. Clearly states goals for the future of the Monographs Department.

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

Supervised

Please circle only one response for each question.

Item	Response				Item	Response			
1.	1	2	3	4	21.	1	2	3	4
2.	1	2	3	4	22.	1	2	3	4
3.	1	2	3	4	23.	1	2	3	4
4.	1	2	3	4	24.	1	2	3	4
5.	1	2	3	4	25.	1	2	3	4
6.	1	2	3	4	26.	1	2	3	4
7.	1	2	3	4					
8.	1	2	3	4					
9.	1	2	3	4					
10.	1	2	3	4					
11.	1	2	3	4					
12.	1	2	3	4					
13.	1	2	3	4					
14.	1	2	3	4					
15.	1	2	3	4					
16.	1	2	3	4					
17.	1	2	3	4					
18.	1	2	3	4					
19.	1	2	3	4					
20.	1	2	3	4					

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

Others

1 = Description fits very well
2 = Description fits fairly well
3 = Description doesn't fit at all
4 = No opinion or not applicable

1. Maintains good working relations with other library units.

2. Gives proper and generous recognition to you for your contributions.

3. Gives proper and generous recognition of your contributions to her superiors.

4. Is receptive to new ideas and encourages innovation and initiative.

5. Is readily approachable when you need to see her.

6. Makes you feel free to ask questions and express ideas.

7. Makes you feel you are working with, rather than for, her.

8. Is fair and impartial in dealing with employees.

9. Has a basic understanding of your total faculty responsibilities: primary assignment and secondary areas.

10. Knowledgeable about technical service operations.

11. Plans, paces and organizes the work of the Monographs Department.

12. Insures that new employees receive thorough training, orientation, and integration into the Monographs Department.

13. Is skilled in managerial/administrative aspects of her position.

14. Is alert to potential problems.

15. Approaches problem solving in a systematic fashion by gathering related information and facts before acting on a problem.

16. Honors confidentiality.

17. Tactful and considerate in dealing with employees.

18. Involved with professional issues.

19. Runs small group meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

20. Runs large group meetings in an efficient and effective manner.

21. Clearly states goals for the future of the Monographs Department.

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

Others

Please circle only one response for each question.

Item	Response			
1.	1	2	3	4
2.	1	2	3	4
3.	1	2	3	4
4.	1	2	3	4
5.	1	2	3	4
6.	1	2	3	4
7.	1	2	3	4
8.	1	2	3	4
9.	1	2	3	4
10.	1	2	3	4
11.	1	2	3	4
12.	1	2	3	4
13.	1	2	3	4
14.	1	2	3	4
15.	1	2	3	4
16.	1	2	3	4
17.	1	2	3	4
18.	1	2	3	4
19.	1	2	3	4
20.	1	2	3	4
21.	1	2	3	4

EVALUATION

HEAD OF MONOGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

PART II. You may, if desired, write a further appraisal using this form. Submit Part II separately to the Head of Monographs Department. To help insure confidentiality, you may want to type your comments.

A. Additional comments on expectations of this position.

B. Other comments.